v. 2

THE

224
2152

WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

VOL. II.

FROM MARCH 6, TO AUG. 22, 1807.

Library of Congress
1807
City of Washington

NEW-YORK:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

BY HOPKINS & SEYMOUR.

1807.

JK2301
.W4

GEP 20 May 1/10

THE

WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

"Of those men who have overturned the Liberties of Republics, the greatest number "have begun their career by paying an obsequious court to the People—commencing "DEMAGOGUES, and ending TYRANTS." HAMILTON.

Vol. II.] NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1807. [No. 27.

FOR THE WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

BEHOLDER.

No. I.

The democratic party have ever evinced a fond partiality to France, and a most bitter antipathy to England. Hence have originated many of the evils which we have endured, and hence the dangers which we now anticipate.

To prove this partiality and this antipathy, little research is necessary. Their operation is discoverable in almost every important measure of our government, and it is less difficult to mention an hundred instances in which they have appeared, than to select those in which their appearance has been the most alarming.

When the revolutionists in France determined to make war upon England, it was a part of their plan that the United States should join them. This is evincible from subsequent facts. This war was, doubtless, resolved on long before it was declared. Previously to its being declared, Mr. Jefferson was in France, enjoying the full confidence of the philosophers and plotters. After his return to this country, and after war was proclaimed, he used all his influence to ally us to France. As our commercial connexions with both the parties at war were extensive and important, it became a serious question what course we should pursue. In the cabinet of our executive contrariant opinions instantly discovered themselves; one for strict neutrality—the other for alliance with France. Of this latter opinion was Mr. Jefferson. He did not, indeed, openly avow his opposition to neutrality; an undisguised support of our war system, (during the derangement of our finances, and the distraction of our affairs,) was too bold and hazardous for success. He, therefore, jesuitically attempted to prevent the President from determining the question of neutrality. He tried to induce him to refer it to Congress. Full well Mr. Jefferson knew, that on Congress-floor, the talents of Hamilton could not be exerted in favour of the neutral system. Full well he knew, that the burning of effigies, and the huzzas of mobs, would have far more influence upon a popular assembly, than upon the executive cabinet. The President, however, perceived the danger of referring the question to Congress; and in April, 1793, he issued the proclamation of neutrality. Mr. Jefferson and his party were defeated; but they raised a hue and cry from state to state against the proceeding. They endeavoured to excite the popular indignation against it, by overloading the press with abuse, and pouring it forth upon Washington and his advisers. The clubs toasted, and Genet remonstrated. The proclamation, however, was approved by both houses of Congress, and thus the party received a heavy blow.

But the wound was not seared, and the Hydra survived it. The democrats attempted a practical construction of the proclamation, which amounted to an alliance with France. Genet contended for the right of arming ships, and enlisting crews in our ports for French service, and proceeded to practise upon this pretended right. The

democrats adopted his theory, and justified his practice. But for this shameful violation of all law, our executive demanded his recal. Accordingly, he was suspended from his ministry, and Fauchet deputed as his successor. He also contended for a construction of neutrality, equally partial and unjust, and his pretensions were supported with warmth and earnestness by the democrats Who, that is not sunk below the milkiness of infancy, does not perceive that this construction was designed to embroil us with England, and draw us into the arms of French fraternity? To connect us with the great republic, in a conflict with Britain? And who, that has one spark of patriotism, does not glow with indignation, when he reviews these mad attempts; when he finds that some of those who should have been our pilots, were striving to push us into that political mælstrom, in which three-fourths of Europe are ingulfed?

The pretensions of the French minister and his adherents were, however, repelled, and a firm, independent, and fair neutrality established. After it was adopted, indeed, Mr. Jefferson defended it; but Genet reproached him with holding an official language different from his confidential. And as the party violently attacked the system, while their chief pretendedly supported it; as his previous and subsequent conduct evinced his hostility to it, we may fairly pronounce him insincere in vindicating it. The party never manifested an hour's acquiescence in the system. They incessantly clamoured against it, and against Hamilton, who advised and advocated it. They endeavoured even to impeach him; but his conduct defied the scrutiny of malice. Discomfited in their attack upon him, they for a moment were comparatively still; but it was the stillness which precedes the storm. The aggressions of England on our trade, soon awoke the tempest. The animosities of our revolution were revived, and the democrats exulted at the prospect of conflicting with Britain. All conciliatory measures were reprobated, and the most high-handed proceedings demanded. Attempts at peaceable adjustment, were declared to be pusillanimous, and negociation little short of treason. The government resolved, however, on one pacific movement. Mr. Jay was sent to England, with instructions to negociate a treaty. It was concluded in November, 1794. Fresh in the public mind is the abuse which was offered to the government, and to the envoy. He was denounced as a British agent, and the government as under British influence. Before the envoy was nominated, the opportunity of embroiling us with England, was thought to be a golden age. It was about this time that Edmund Randolph told Fauchet, "*the friends of liberty are for an intimate union with France.*"

The treaty was ratified in August, 1795. Was the ratification unopposed? Never were witnessed exertions more strenuous, and more alarming, than those of the democrats after the arrival, and before the confirmation of the treaty. The partizans of the French compassed sea and land for proselytes. Mobs were collected, petitions drawn, effigies burnt, and peals of clamour rung on all the changes of democracy. The leaven of French iniquity, put the whole union in fermentation. Even Washington, though convinced of the expediency of ratifying the treaty, feared a commotion might ensue. In a letter to one of the heads of department, dated July 31st, 1795, he says, "If the treaty is ratified, *the partizans of the French* (or rather of *war and confusion*) will excite them to hostile measures." He also says, "No stone has been left unturned, that could impress the people's minds with the most *arrant falsehoods.*" The treaty, however, was ratified, and democracy again defeated.

Unable, in any of these shapes, to elude the grasp of government, Proteus assumed another. The appropriations for the treaty had not yet been granted. The war party saw, that if it were carried into operation, all their plans would be frustrated; no cause of quarrel with England would remain. They, therefore, determined to refuse the necessary appropriations, and thus

destroy the treaty. The right of deciding whether it should be effective was claimed by the House of Representatives, a body, from which the constitution had wisely withheld it. This claim was the dernier resort of democracy, and worthy of its supporters. In their eyes, violated oaths, and a violated constitution, were not to be compared with a French alliance, and an English war. With a madness which God inflicts on those whom he intends to destroy, they attempted to sunder the ligaments of national faith, and involve us in a contest in which it would have been impiety to pray for success. Rapt in the gulf-stream of passion, they were borne far from the coast of reason, without even a wish to return. But the appropriation was voted, and the country saved. This vote was the plank on which our nation reached the shore. It was the scarf of Leucothoe on the bosom of Ulysses. The French minister and his partisans, however, whose element was destruction, and who, with exultation, were ready to plunder the wreck, deplored our escape, and, like envy, as described by Ovid, lamented that there was no cause for lamentation. All hopes of a war with England were blasted, and some new proof of hatred to her was to be exhibited in partiality to France. In the sequel we shall see how it was shown.

AMERICANUS.

FOR THE WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

There are often practices in community, passing altogether unheeded, which every man ought to feel himself imperiously called upon to oppose. At the head of the list, are the schemes of certain literary Charlatans to accumulate money, at the expense of the important interests of literature.

A custom is now becoming very common in America, of making trifling alterations in European works, republishing them with great pretensions of important improvements and additions, and claiming, upon the ground of these, a copy-right to secure the exclusive sale. When these tricks are confined to mere ephemeral productions, the evil consequences are trifling; but when they are practised, as is generally the case, upon works of acknowledged merit, and extensive circulation, the public are almost certain to sustain a loss through the real *injury* which the book receives.

It is very doubtful whether there can, in any instance, be legal grounds for an American copy-right of an English book. If it were legal, under any circumstances, it would be so only in cases where the work underwent so complete an alteration, as to bear the complexion of an entire new production. But what will be the opinion of a person possessing a knowledge of the laws of our country, of the notices occasionally seen in our newspapers, of copy-rights claimed for improved editions of Enfield's Philosophy, Ferguson's Astronomy, Ferguson's Lectures, and especially of Murray's English Grammar? Indeed, the books generally selected for the purpose of alterations, from their very nature, afford not the smallest grounds for expecting any real improvement. They are works which have gained an extensive circulation, in consequence of the merits which they possessed, as they came from the hands of the authors.

It will, therefore, require no moderate share of assurance in any individual, to attempt the improvement of *such* publications. But the *auri sacra fames* can embolden to any thing. A bookseller, who can succeed in producing a belief in the public, that he is possessed of an improved edition of a book of the above description, may name his own terms, and command his own profits. The absurdity and mischief of this practice, cannot be better exemplified, than by exhibiting the various "improvements" and copy rights which are sometimes claimed on a single book; and, for this purpose, we select that very popular and saleable work, Murray's English Grammar, and its Abridgment. This book has attained to a celebrity and a circulation, perhaps

unequalled by any other publication of our times.

In a review of Murray's works, in a late number of the "Panoplist," it is stated, that in England, the larger Grammar sells at the rate of twelve thousand copies a year, and the Abridgment at twenty-four thousand; and that in this country, their sale is not less considerable. So very *saleable* a work, presents to our honest book-improvers, and copy-right hunters, an object highly worthy of their attention: accordingly, we see a new Abridgment of Murray's Grammar, published at Boston, professing to have been executed by a "Teacher of Youth," and expressing in the title page, as a sort of *noli me tangere*, "Improvements secured according to Law." The "improvements" contemplated in this edition, consist in shortening the work; Murray's own Abridgment being considered too long for the younger class of learners. This "Teacher of Youth," did not think it necessary to make any other essential alterations. Abridging, he supposes, secures a copy-right; and abridging is, therefore, alone attempted.

About the same period, there was published at Worcester, another edition of Murray's Abridgment. This neither lengthened nor shortened the original work; but claimed a copy-right for a "New System of Punctuation." This edition will probably be the last of the kind executed at Worcester; the "New System of Punctuation," here mentioned, is found to be so much inferior to that by MURRAY himself, that the bookseller will experience more difficulty in selling, than in altering the book.

But we have not done with Murray's Abridgment. A Dr. Abercrombie, a teacher of an academy in Philadelphia, has laid claim to a third copy-right! Whether it is, that by advancing south, the capacities of youth are found to be greater, and therefore require more enlarged treatises, we shall not pretend to determine; but our copy-right holder in Philadelphia, appears to have altered the book, with views exactly opposite to those of his fellow-teacher at Boston. One makes it *shorter*, whilst the other makes it *longer!* "Who shall decide, when [teachers] disagree?"

As the publication of this Philadelphia edition, seems to be attended with circumstances very singular, (to say the least of them) we must take notice of it in a more particular manner. The first things that struck us on seeing the advertisement of it in the newspapers, were two recommendatory certificates from certain gentlemen and *ladies* of the doctor's acquaintance in Philadelphia. The first states, that the subscribers "highly approve both of the work itself, as it came from the pen of Mr. Murray, and of the additions which have been made to it!" Now we naturally marvel at all this; for, on casting our eyes at the book, we found that Abercrombie has, in fact, given the *imperfections* of Murray's Grammar, as his ostensible motive for publishing his "improved" edition. How, therefore, could they approve of *both?* The *well-meaning* signers of these certificates, will do well, in future, to examine a book, before they recommend it. They may, by that precaution, escape the embarrassing predicament into which they have foolishly precipitated themselves.

Here are a few quotations from Abercrombie; and, first, from his advertisement—"A frequent review of "Murray's Grammar, has led the pre-"sent editor to remark some *deficien-"cies*, which the experience of several "years in teaching, has convinced him "might be supplied with advantage." At the close of this advertisement, we are informed, that "An *improved* edi-"tion of Murray's larger Grammar, "by Dr. Abercrombie, will be pub-"lished in the course of a few weeks." The following is from his preface—— "From his (Murray's) not being in the "habit of teaching, *he cannot be so well* "acquainted with the questions which "may be proposed by an attentive and "inquisitive student, as he who is daily "engaged in inculcating and explaining "the elements of our language," &c. "This must be my apology for the

" present undertaking." Among the notes introduced by Abercrombie, we observe the following:—" This defini- " tion (by Murray) involves some de- " gree of obscurity. The *truth is*, that " the author here, with many other " Grammarians, gives to two tenses, " which are really distinct from each " other, the same name."

We have said before, that the publication of this work was attended with *singularities*. One we have exhibited, which, however, affects the editor's friends more than himself. That now to be mentioned, attaches to the *Editor*; and we apprehend that it will require *all* his ingenuity to extricate himself. When the advertisement of this "*improved*" edition was first presented to us, we thought we had seen, not 12 months ago, in the newspapers, published by this *same person*, an address to his pupils, in which Murray's Grammar was *most highly* extolled and recommended, as a performance which, one would have thought, the writer of the panegyric could hardly have ventured to represent *himself* as capable of " *improving*." We have hunted up this address, and from it now quote the following:

" In acquiring this valuable branch " of instruction, (Grammar) you have " been guided, not by the faint and un- " certain glimmerings of a *taper*, the " just emblem of the too generally re- " ceived abridgments, but by the strong " and steady TORCH-LIGHT (a truly *luminous* figure!) of the larger gram- " mar of Mr. LINDLEY MURRAY; a " gentleman, whose unwearied ex- " ertions on this subject, have done " more towards elucidating the obscu- " rities, and embellishing the structure " of our language, than any other wri- " ter upon that subject. To him the " world is indebted for an invaluable " work, which must immortalize his " name in the annals of science and po- " lite literature. Such a work has " long been wanted, and, from the suc- " cess with which it is executed, can- " not be too highly appreciated. " While to this meritorious, this ines- " timable work, we attach that value " which its intrinsic excellence de- " mands, let us remember with grati- " tude and patriotic pride, that its pi- " ous and learned author, is a native of " *our* country. That Lindley Murray, " who has so successfully employed his " time and talents in establishing for " our language, a standard of gramma- " tical purity and elegance, is an *Ame- " rican*. It was the want of such a " work, which induced the celebrated " Dr. Knox, in his elaborate and learn- " ed treatise upon education, to lament " that the study of English Grammar " had been so long neglected, even in " the most approved schools," &c. &c.

An uncivil critic would, no doubt, have burst into an indecorous fit of laughter, at the ridiculous figure our editor displays on this occasion; but we shall preserve our gravity, and hear our *modest* Doctor announce HIS "improved" edition of the above Grammar, with all imaginable composure. Neither will we harbour any thing of that indignation, which many would experience at his *present* attempt to prove Murray not a competent judge, because he is not also a pedagogue; when, not twelve months ago, his Grammar was an " invaluable work," " a standard for grammatical purity," &c. &c. The grounds of our indifference will be understood without dwelling much upon them. Sentiments so contradictory, and contrivances so imbecile, carry their own refutation along them. Perhaps the most charitable construction we can give is, to conclude that our editor's " TORCH-LIGHT" is extinguished. He now, alas! sees only by aid of his " TAPER!" However, whilst upon this subject, it may perhaps be due to the author of that very excellent work, to state, that no publication within the last century, has experienced such unqualified approbation from *teachers*, who have *tried* its merits, as this grammar. It is needless, as it would be endless to adduce the numerous testimonies, which have been given to that effect; but we cannot resist an inclination to present the sentiments of a veteran in the field of education, and who, perhaps, has had as much experience in that department, as any teacher of the

present day. This is no other than the celebrated, the venerable WALKER; to whom the public are indebted for a standard of English pronunciation. "I need not acquaint the public with the success of Lindley Murray's Grammar, which appears to have superseded every other. Indeed, when we consider the *plain, simple mode of instruction* he has adopted, the extent of observation he has displayed, and the copious variety of illustration he has added, we shall not wonder that his Grammar has been so universally admired."—*Walker's outlines of English Grammar.*

Again:

"Mr. Murray's Grammar, and selections of lessons for reading, are the best in the English language."—*Walker's Elements of Elocution.*

With regard to the "improvements" pretended to have been made, we declare our conviction, that more insignificant, unnecessary, and irrelevant matter, was never conjured up to accomplish the object which our editor has had in view. A great proportion of the additions, consist in giving in notes at the bottom of the page, the etymology of the terms, all of which appear to have been derived from Johnson's dictionary. We will present a specimen from the first page we open. In this, the words *Number*, *Singular*, and *Plural*, occur in the text; to each of which, the *learned* Doctor attaches a *learned* note—thus;

"From the *Latin* word NUMERUS, number.

"From the *Latin* word SINGULARIS, single one, and no more.

"From the *Latin* word PLURALIS, more than one."

The public should lend their ear with great caution to all pretended "improvements" of European works; and when they see a bookseller, or any other mere money-making adventurer, hold up to view, a copy-right to secure him the profits arising from the *exclusive sale* of the article, they may safely regard it as the cloven foot, which leads to the detection of the unsoundness of the owner. What a contrast do these adventurers often form with the real authors of the works they profess to improve. Thus, Lindley Murray, whose legal right in the sale of his books in Great-Britain, produces an independent fortune, bestows, it is said, the whole avails upon charitable institutions. Is it not degrading, to think that there should be found in this country, so many who have no legal or equitable right, contriving such disgraceful means to make money from these books? We have a knowledge of a proposition being lately made by a bookseller to a dabbler in literature, to alter *all* of Murray's works, in order to secure a copy-right for them.

But it is time to take our leave of the copy-right holders, and copy-right seekers we have mentioned, and to return to the general principles we first endeavoured to discuss, and from which we have been imperceptibly drawn by descending to particulars. We shall give several specific reasons why the practice ought to be abandoned, and then dismiss the subject.

1. This practice marks great injustice to authors, especially to those who are living. What has cost them, perhaps, years of reflection, to bring into system and order, and to make correct and harmonious in all its parts, is deranged, mutilated, and distorted by the crude and hasty variations and additions of an interested bookseller, or one whom he employs for his purposes. The reputation of an author is frequently, by this means, very much affected. A conduct so unfair is peculiarly reprehensible in printers and booksellers, who derive their support from authors. Their interest and credit are indeed mutually dependent. On this ground they should honourably support one another.

2. The interests of science and literature demand the abolition of this ungenerous practice. Alterations made in books of education, or which may be much read by youth, will, we may reasonably suppose, be often improperly and irregularly made, when the motive for altering is interest, and when alteration alone is all that is requi-

red. By adhering to a work or system, that has met with public approbation, and to which the author's name is affixed; sound and regular instruction is more likely to be communicated, than by adopting unauthorized and anonymous additions and alterations.

3. This principle of variation must be continually extending itself. Each "editor" will, in pursuit of his object, insert his peculiar diversities, till, at length, amidst so many hands, the original work will be entirely metamorphosed or extremely heterogeneous.

4. So great a transformation of authors will, probably, in the end, defeat its own purpose. But, in the mean time, many liberally minded and conscientious booksellers, will be discouraged from printing the books in their original form; and many young persons will be irregularly and erroneously instructed. How much more rational and honourable for all booksellers to consult their own interest and credit, the reputation of authors, and the advancement of literature.

5. It is a mistake to suppose that any copy right can be legally attached to these interpolated editions. The law of copy-right was intended to promote literature. But injustice to authors, injury to works of science, and the encouragement of interested tricks of this nature, will never advance learning and rational improvement. They contravene the intent of the law, and will, therefore, never be countenanced by courts of equity or justice.

FOR THE WEEKLY INSPECTOR.

On taking a comparative view of the proceedings of the present administration; contrasting their actions with those of the former; an immeasurable distance expands itself, and a wide field of reprehension opens before us.

Under the auspices of a WASHINGTON and an ADAMS, our country was truly blessed. Firm, dignified, and energetic, they raised it to the summit of grandeur. Whilst on the one hand, the balmy sweets of peace were fostered, and the happiness of the people consulted; still, on the other hand, no invidious nation durst attempt to sever these paramount objects. On the least signal given, their "home-spun" pride immediately took the alarm. Energetic proceedings constituted their characteristic mark, and no cringing insipidity could be traced. By these means, our country stood high in the estimation of surrounding nations; and whilst that estimation increased with our energy, respect for ourselves was still more cherished. Treason was suppressed; all discontents were quelled; and the nation arrived at the highest pitch of sublimity.

Contrast this concise view with the proceedings of the imbecile faction now in power, and we observe our country insulted by the meanest of nations, and no energetic means taken for redress. Scoffed and menaced at by the Barbary powers; insults and depredations openly committed by the imbecile Dons, the foot-stools of France; still viewing those derogatory circumstances, our administration tamely and basely permitted them to pass without reprehension.

Let me ask, fellow-citizens, to what infamy, to what detestation, ought the patronizers of such acts be consigned? The question needs no answer—It strikes home to the demagogues.

Treason stalks in open day, and whilst discontent is manifesting itself amongst depraved men, our cabinet indolently views the operations of the country, and exerts no nerve to suppress them.

These, fellow-citizens, are incontestable facts—Federalists! to you the important care of the country is now confided. Let the same energy, firmness, and dignity, stimulate your actions, that were inculcated by WASHINGTON, and your country still may lift its drooping head. Let not vile demagogues infuse into your bosoms the poisonous liquid of despair: Let not their economical plans lure into false security, and all is safe. But, unless you are guided by the spirit of WASHINGTON, you are climbing a frightful precipice, to the summit of which you will never arrive. BRUTUS.

To the Editor of the Weekly Inspector.

SIR,

The various opinions, and singular doctrines which have lately been advanced, both in the National Legislature and private conversation, on the system of naval defence by gun-boats, have induced me to examine the efficiency, and the economy of that system, with some attention:—the result of my examination has completely satisfied my mind, that the system is incomparably less efficient, less economical, and of course, more absurd, than it had previously appeared to me;—and, as the course of inquiry which has satisfied me, appears to be well calculated to convey the same conviction to the minds of others, I beg leave, through the medium of your useful paper, to convey some observations to my countrymen.

I have examined the gun-boats of the latest construction, which, I presume, are considered by government as built upon the most approved plan—They are of the following description, viz.

Length - - - -	50 feet,
Breadth - - - -	18
Height between decks for the accommodation of the crews,	4 feet nearly.

They are to be schooner rigged, and to carry, each, *one* heavy gun, working on a circle between the two masts.—Each boat to be manned with *fifty* men, officers included.

Fifty of these boats are considered by the President of the United States as adequate to the protection of this harbour, the sound, and the coast, as far as Cape Cod; and two hundred, he regards, as sufficient to the defence of the entire coast of the union.

We will consider first, the efficiency of the system.

The usual mode of estimating the relative importance of artillery, is to compare the weight of shot which can be thrown in a given time. A heavy gun cannot be loaded and discharged with the same celerity as a light one, and, therefore, the ratio of power does not correspond with the size of the calibre. I will, however, consider the fifty thirty-two pounders, on which we are to rely for safety, as capable of discharging in an hour, as great a weight of balls, as the eighty guns which are borne by what is usually called a seventy-four gun ship;—and this will be considered by every artillerist as a large concession.

The *essential* damage which can be done to vessels of war, is in a great degree confined to the water line and near it. Ships have fought until four port-holes have been beaten into one, and yet have not been taken or sunk, but have returned into port. Shot between wind and water, as it is usually called, or on the water line, are more dangerous.

The seventy-four gun ship, in the extreme length of her broadside, exposes a water line less than two hundred feet. Supposing the fifty gun-boats in action with her, to lye *bow on*, the *shortest* possible water line, exposed by each, is eighteen feet, amounting in the whole to nine hundred feet, and whenever they present their broadsides, as they sometimes must, their water line amounts to two thousand five hundred feet.

The disproportion in the relative strength of the two machines, is obviously much greater than that of the size of their guns. A twelve pound

shot will more easily penetrate a gun-boat, than a thirty-two pound shot will a ship of the line.

In a calm, I allow, that gun-boats, possessing the power, in some measure, of choosing their position by means of oars, will have the advantage of a heavy ship; in deep water this advantage might sometimes prove irresistible; but in a harbour, where the ship would anchor with springs on her cables, it would be trifling.

In a breeze, the seventy-four gun ship will outsail the gun-boats, and, unless they take shelter in shallow water, will have no more difficulty in running down a squadron of them, than a ship of three hundred tons would have in running down a fleet of Birch Canoes.

It results then, that in point of efficiency, the fifty gun-boats in a calm, may be considered as equal to one ship of seventy-four guns; but in rough water, or a fresh breeze, utterly inferior.

I ought, however, to state one further consideration, which gives to the ship, in every circumstance, an immense advantage; it is, that her force is compact, her crew disciplined—and under the eye and absolute command of one man: whereas, the fifty gun-boats must have fifty commanders, a number which can never be expected to act in concert, even if there existed the best discipline on board each boat.

Let us next consider the economy of the gun-boat system, with respect to human life, a consideration which ought not to have escaped the *friends of the people*.

A seventy-four gun ship, in the British service, is considered as fully manned with six hundred men.

The fifty gun-boats with which we are to oppose her, require *two thousand five hundred*.

The six hundred men on board the seventy-four, are sheltered in a great measure from the enemy's fire.

The two thousand five hundred men on board the fifty gun-boats, must all be upon deck in action, and completely exposed; the waist of the boat not being either high enough, or strong enough to shelter even their legs. The boats must of course never approach within the reach of musketry or grape. And, in addition to this *humane* exposure of lives and limbs, no provision is made on board for the comfort of the wounded.—So much for the humanity of the system.

Next let us consider the economy of expense.

Each boat, of the dimensions before described, has cost in this port, three thousand dollars for the naked hull; to rig and equip her for sea, I am informed, by experienced men, will cost four thousand dollars more, making a total for each gun that is water borne, of seven thousand dollars, or one thousand five hundred and seventy five pounds sterling.

In the British service, the estimate some years ago, was one thousand pounds a gun, for ships of the line;—allowing a rise of fifty per cent. in the expense of ship building, then the first cost of their ships per gun, will be equal to that of ours.

But the expense of a navy does not arise so much from the first cost of the machinery, as from the annual expense of manning and victualling. And here the wisdom of our legislators shines with splendid superiority;—for while, in the British service, eight men to a gun are considered a full compliment, for distant expeditions, we *economically*

employ fifty men to a gun, for harbour duty.

So that the two hundred gun-boats which, by the transcendent wisdom of our rulers, are destined to guard this happy land, will require to man them, *ten thousand* men.

While in the British service, ten thousand men would be a large compliment for fifteen ships of eighty guns each.

I will not calculate the immense disparity of expense of the wages of officers in the two systems—I will merely state their numbers, which must stand nearly thus:

In the Gun-Boats,

For six Flotillas, each one,		6 com.
200 Boats, captains, each one,		200 cap.
Lieutenants, each two,		400 lieut.
Total, commissioned officers,		606

In the British service,

For fifteen 80 gun ships,	Admirals	3
	Captains, each one,	15
	Lieutenants, each four,	60
Total, commissioned officers,		78

The economists then, in order to put afloat two hundred guns, will employ six hundred and six commissioned officers, and nine thousand three hundred and ninety four petty officers and men.

While the prodigal Britons, in fifteen ships, of eighty guns each, put afloat twelve hundred guns, and employ seventy-eight commissioned officers, and nine thousand nine hundred and thirty-two petty officers and men.

Thus, the annual expense of our two hundred guns, which are destined to lurk in mud-holes, will be equal to twelve hundred British cannon, a force sufficient to command the respect of mankind in every quarter of the ocean: for it is conceded in that model of naval, military, and economical wisdom, the late presidential message on the subject of gun-boats, that "this species "of naval armament can have little ef- "fect towards protecting our commerce "in *the open seas*, even upon our own "coasts."

But I am answered, that it is not intended to man all the boats except in in case of war;—doubtless. Neither are the British ships manned, except in case of war:—but when manned, and in whatever extent, both officers and men must be paid, and must eat; and the disparity of expense in the two systems, will be in the same proportion.

I presume that the same sublime strain of wisdom will pervade the whole system, and be displayed in the means of procuring men with the same splendour, as in the devising and building of the machines. The law which was passed some years since, will render useless the old fashioned and exploded forms of enlistment, and guard the liberties of the people from the abomination of impressment. According to that law, when danger menaces any harbour, or any foreign ship behaves naughty; somebody is to inform the governor, and the governor is to desire the marshal to call upon the militia general or colonel in the neighbourhood, to call upon the captains, to call upon the drummers (those gentlemen, who, we are informed, from high military authority, are all important in the day of battle,) to beat to arms, and call the militia men together; and from these men are to be *draughted* (not impressed) a sufficient number to go on board the gun-boats, and drive the naughty stranger away, unless he should have taken himself off during this long ceremonial.

My friends of the militia must permit me to describe the accommodations which they will find on board:—as the height between decks is not quite four feet, they will not only not be able to stand upright under cover, but cannot sit upright, unless they squat upon the floor like puppies in a dog kennel;—a most elegant situation, in which we are all liable in turn to be placed by those admirable *friends of the people*, our sagacious rulers.

Such is the gun-boat system. Yet there are legislators who call this prodigality, this wasteful imbecility, by the name of economy; and men in the community who, from want of reflection, suffer themselves to be duped by this palpable falsehood and nonsense.

MESSAGE,

From the President of the United States, communicating information of the effect of Gun-Boats in the protection and defence of harbours; of the numbers thought necessary, and of the proposed distribution of them, among the ports and harbours of the United States, in compliance with a resolution of the house of the 5th instant. February 19, 1807, ordered to lie on the table.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

In compliance with the request of the House of Representatives, expressed in their resolution of the 5th instant, I proceed to give such information, as is possessed, of the effect of Gun-Boats in the protection and defence of harbours, of the numbers thought necessary, and of the proposed distribution of them, among the ports and harbours of the U. States.

Under present circumstances, and governed by the intentions of the legislature, as manifested by their annual appropriations of money for the purposes of defence, it has been concluded to combine, 1st, land batteries, furnished with heavy cannon and mortars, and established on all the points around the place favourable for preventing vessels from lying before it; 2d, moveable artillery, which may be carried, as occasion may require, to points unprovided with fixed batteries; 3d, floating batteries; and 4th, gun-boats, which may oppose an enemy at the entrance, and co-operate with the batteries for his expulsion.

On this subject professional men were consulted as far as we had opportunity.—General Wilkinson, and the late Gen. Gates, gave their opinions in writing, in favour of the system, as will be seen by their letters now communicated. The higher officers of the navy gave the same opinions, in separate conferences, as their presence at the seat of government offered occasions of consulting them, and no difference of judgment appeared on the subject. Those of Com. Barron and Capt. Tingey, now here, are recently furnished in writing, and transmitted herewith to the Legislature.

The efficacy of Gun-Boats for the defence of harbours, and of other smooth and enclosed waters, may be estimated, in part, from that of Gallies, formerly much used, but less powerful, more costly in their construction and maintenance, and requiring more men. But the Gun-Boat itself is believed to be in use with every modern maritime nation, for the purposes of defence. In the Mediterranean, on which are several small powers, whose system, like ours, is peace and defence, few harbours are without this article of protection. Our own experience there of the effect of Gun-Boats, for harbour service, is recent. Algiers is particularly known to have owed to a great provision of these vessels, the safety of its City, since the epoch of their construction. Before that, it had been repeatedly insulted and injured. The effect of Gun-Boats, at present, in the neighbourhood of Gibraltar, is well known, and how much they were used, both in attack and defence of that place, during a former war. The extensive resort to them, by the two greatest naval powers in the world, on an enteprise of invasion not long since in prospect, shows their confidence in their efficacy, for the purposes for which they are suited. By the northern powers of Europe, whose seas are particularly adapted to them, they are still more used. The remarkable action, between the Russian flotilla of Gun-Boats and Gallies, and a Turkish Fleet of Ships of the Line and Frigates, in the Liman Sea, (in one thousand seven hundred and eighty eight) will be readily recollected. The latter, commanded by their most celebeated Admiral, were completely defeated, and several of their Ships of the Line destroyed.

From the opinions given, as to the number of Gun-Boats necessary for some of the principal Sea Ports, and from a view of all the towns and ports, from Orleans to Main, inclusive, entitled to protection, in proportion to their situation and circumstances, it is concluded that, to give them a due measure of protection in times of war, about 200 Gun-Boats will be requisite. According to first ideas, the following would be their general distribution; liable to be varied, on more

mature examination, and as circumstances shall vary; that is to say,

To the Missisippi and its neighbouring waters, 40 Gun-Boats.

To Savannah and Charleston, and the harbours on each side, from St. Mary's to Currituck, 25.

To the Chesapeake and its waters, 20.

To Delaware bay and river, 15.

To New-York, the Sound, and waters as far as Cape Cod, 50.

To Boston and the harbours north of Cape Cod, 50.

The flotillas assigned to these several stations might each be under the care of particular commandants, and the vessels composing them would, in ordinary, be distributed among the harbours within the station, in proportion to their importance.

Of these boats, a proper proportion would be of the larger size, such as those heretofore built, capable of navigating any seas, and of reinforcing occasionally the strength even of the most distant parts, when menaced with danger. The residue would be confided to their own, or the neighbouring harbours; would be smaller, less furnished for accommodation, and consequently less costly. Of the number supposed necessary, 73 are built or building, and the hundred and 27 still to be provided, would cost from five to six hundred thousand dollars. Having regard to the convenience of the treasury, as well as to the resources for building, it has been thought that the one half of these might be built in the present year, and the other half the next. With the legislature, however, it will rest to stop where we are, or at any further point, when they shall be of opinion that the number provided shall be sufficient for the object.

At times, when Europe, as well as the United States shall be at peace, it would not be proposed that more than six or eight of these vessels should be kept afloat. When Europe is in war, treble that number might be necessary, to be distributed among those particular harbours which foreign vessels of war are in the habit of frequenting, for the purpose of preserving order therein. But they would be manned in ordinary, with only their complement for navigation, relying on the seaman and militia of the port, if called into action on any sudden emergency. It would be only when the U. States should themselves be at war, that the whole number would be brought into active service, and would be ready in the first moments of the war, to co-operate with other means for covering at once the line of our seaports. At all times, those unemployed, would be withdrawn into places not exposed to sudden enterprise, hauled up under sheds covered from the sun and weather, and kept in preservation with little expense for repairs or maintenance.

It must be superfluous to observe, that this species of naval armament is proposed merely for defensive operation; that it can have but little effect towards protecting our commerce in the open sea, even on our own coast; and still less can it become an excitement to engage in offensive maritime war, towards which it would furnish no means.

THOMAS JEFFERSON.

Feb. 10, 1807.

THE ANSWER,

Of the House of Assembly of the State of New-York, to the Speech of his Excellency the Governor.

To his Excellency MORGAN LEWIS, Esq. *Governor of the State of New-York.*

SIR—We are duly sensible of the blessings and benefits which, under a kind Providence, we have enjoyed for the last year; more particularly have we reason to be grateful that our Commercial Cities have been exempt from the scourge of that pestilence with which they have heretofore so often been afflicted.

Under a wise and prudent Administration of our national concerns, our country enjoys a degree of prosperity which seldom, if ever, has been paralleled.

And we embrace this occasion to testfy our approbation of the firmness, independence, and liberality of the administration of this state, and fondly anticipate that the period is not far distant, when tranquillity and harmony will be restored among us; when we may become one people, firmly united in the support of a mild and liberal policy, calculated to ensure order, protection and true liberty.

We concur with your Excellency in opinion, that the militia of our country constitutes its chief bulwark and only legitimate defence, the well organization of which, we conceive of the first importance in a free country. We promise vigilantly to investigate the errors and defects in the present militia system, and to use our best endeavours to correct them.

Your Excellency's unremitted and extraordinary attention to this important object, merits our warmest approbation, and we have the fullest confidence, will prove ultimately of great public utility.

The other matters referred to by your excellency, shall receive that attention from us, that their relative importance may seem to require.

We unite with your Excellency in the wish, that nothing may be wanting to render our session beneficial to our country.

HIS EXCELLENCY'S REPLY.

GENTLEMEN,

To a grateful people sensible of the many blessings they enjoy, new motives to the performance of duties, and the exertions of

means promising a continuance of the divine favour, need not be urged.

Professing to look forward with pleasing expectation, to the period which shall restore tranquillity and harmony, to a divided people, you give a pledge of mutual forbearance that will facilitate the public business, and of comity which shall preserve the dignity of a legislative assembly.

In the honourable, though delicate post to which my countrymen have thought proper to call me, the jealousies of others, and the passions of all whom interest or ambition may excite, no virtue, no integrity can oppose an impenetrable shield to censure It the most essential services and superior elevation of character, could not save the father of his country from reproach, even after a silent tomb had received the ashes of the illustrious chief; if mildness of manners and benevolence of heart cannot protect the statesman and philosophic friend of man, the chief of our confederacy, from aspersion, it were vanity consummate, in one far inferior to either, to hope for universal approbation. It was not to be found in what I considered the straightway path, and I could not turn aside to seek it.

Sensible of my own imperfections, I am willing to believe I may have committed errors; but I had fondly hoped they were such, if any, as merited indulgence rather than asperity. Conscious that, to the extent of my ability, the public good has been the leading object of my political career; I have submitted to obloquy with no little resignation. The approving voice of the immediate representatives of my fellow citizens is, however, an ample recompense, and affords a gratification which can only be expressed in acknowledgments of your liberality and candour.

MORGAN LEWIS.

FROM THE EVENING POST.

Verbum sat.—It is an excellent observation of Lord Chesterfield, (and no man understood human nature better) that *a wise man, when he sees difficulties in his way, stands still—fools only rush on and act.*

Beaumarchais.—In the revolutionary war, America received supplies of cloathing and military stores from Mr. de Beaumarchais. It was notorious that this gentleman was incapable of furnishing them from his own resources—it was believed, therefore, that he derived his means from the royal treasury. Afterwards, when Mr. Franklin, the American minister, settled our accounts with Monsieur de Vergennes, the United States were charged under three distinct heads, viz:—Loans, Subsidies, and Free Gift. The payments under each of these heads was distinctly pointed out, except that of one million, given in 1776; and when Mr. Franklin desired to know what had become of that money, he was told, that being a gift, no explanation was necessary. Mr Franklin was, or appeared to be satisfied. Before that settlement, however, Mr. Beaumarchais, who had an agent in America, pressed for payment of supplies furnished, and obtained from Congress, bills for two millions four hundred thousand livres on their ministers in Europe, who, by the bye, had no means of payment. Mr. Gerard, the French minister at Philadelphia, (brother to Mr Rayneval, a secretary in the count de Vergennes' office,) patronized Mr. de Beaumarchais' demand, which, however, was represented by some of the public servants in Europe as wholly unfounded, and a mere scheme to put money in the pockets of individuals. There was not much opposition, therefore, in Congress. The resolution was carried, on the principle, that America, having received the supplies, ought to pay for them: That, to say the court furnished funds, was an assertion without proof; and the claim being made with the privity and countenance of the French ministers, it was to be presumed, agreeable to his superiors:—Finally, that as the American minister in Paris would hardly accept the bills before he was assured of means to pay them, the court could, if they pleased, set matters right there.

These bills made afterwards a serious deduction from a subsidy of six millions, granted by the king for carrying on the war. When Monsieur de Luzerne, the successor of Monsieur Gerard, learnt that the subsidy had been anticipated in that manner, he expressed dissatisfaction in strong terms, and desired that if Mr. de Beaumar-

chais made any more claims, he might be referred for payment to the French court.

The claim slept for a long time, and as it seemed pretty clear that the million unaccounted for, had been fingered by Mr. de Beaumarchais, it was natural to press for a disclosure, in order that it might be charged to him here, in the settlement of his accounts:—but Mr. Franklin conceiving, perhaps, that the circumstance was not important, made the settlement above mentioned. Perhaps he could obtain no other—perhaps he did not feel himself in a condition to insist that the alleged gift should not appear in the account, till the application of it was disclosed.—Perhaps the old gentleman thought it most prudent to let the article stand open for such elucidation as time might afford.

Two reasons may be assigned for secrecy. The one of a public nature, certainly had weight. France had affected a strict neutrality previous to the treaty by which our neutrality was acknowledged, and had occasionally given assurances to that effect; and, even at lord Stormont's instigation, had seized goods, and embargoed vessels destined for this country. On these occasions, Beaumarchais made strong representations, claiming his rights as a citizen, and complaining of the injury to his property. These, which were calculated for lord Stormont's inspection, proved a little too much. Persons who understood the French government, knew that such remonstrances would not have been hazarded by any one, not previously sure of protection. If, however, after so many assurances, it had been acknowledged that this very Mr. Beaumarchais was employed by the ministry to send out these very goods at the king's expense, it would have furnished the British government with the proof they wanted.

The second was, perhaps, the efficient reason, though of a private nature Perhaps the French minister, good naturedly, wished that America, in prosperity, should refund to the king's subjects, what had been granted by his majesty's bounty in our adverse condition, and he might not be unwilling that Mr. Rayneval, an old and able servant, should share a handsome sum with Mr. de Beaumarchais.

After the king was dethroned, the American minister in France was so fortunate as to obtain a copy of Mr. de Beaumarchais' receipt. Now as the French government formerly alleged the free gift of a million, and as the receipt of Mr. de Beaumarchais has been since given to show how that million was disposed of, it seems no more than reasonable at this time, when they demand payment for Mr. de Beaumarchais, that they should prove the million in question, was applied to our use in some other way.

NEW-YORK, Feb. 28.

A message has been received from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the American ministers in London, on the subject of the negociation; and a letter from the minister at Paris, relative to the late imperial decree; also, a letter from Cowles Mead, acting governor of the Missisippi territory, respecting the surrender of Aaron Burr.

THOMAS MORRIS, Esq. is appointed clerk of the city, in the room of Tunis Wortman, removed; and Archibald Kirley, one of the wardens of the port.

Messrs. Bollman and Swartwout have been discharged by the supreme court.

The House of Representatives of the United States appropriated on the 21st instant, 150,000 dollars for gunboats, and the same sum for fortifications.

The editor of the Political Register, Philadelphia, in commenting on the late proceedings of administration, relative to Burr's conspiracy, has the following:

"Whence, we ask, has it happened that a suspected attack by some Americans against the possessions of Spain, should have excited so much alarm, as to prostrate all the barriers of our civil rights—while a flagrant and an avowed

attempt, by that very power, to dismember our union, and to spread the flame of civil war throughout our country, has been entirely overlooked by the administration, and as it would seem, buried in oblivion.

Is the protection of the Spanish mines, an object of greater consideration with our rulers, than the quiet possession of our own farms? Or, (admitting as a fact what remains yet to be ascertained) is the projected invasion of her territories, by a band of free-booters, of less consequence than the systematized subversion of our own government, liberty, and laws, by the commissioned agents of the Spanish crown?

We repeat these questions, and shall reiterate them, until the proceedings of the administration shall satisfy the public mind, whether the pensions of Spain have been limited to those who are already accused and convicted of having received them.

—

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The "BEHOLDEN" appears not to have been a careless spectator of the proceedings in the American body politic. We are proud of his correspondence, and court the continuance of his favours.

The Gentleman who has obliged us with a communication, relative to the practices of certain literary quacks, in *manufacturing* copy-rights of English, and other books, to the prejudice of the authors, has expressed sentiments much to our mind. We have had it in contemplation for some time to offer a few observations on the same subject, and we may still, at some future period, take further notice of this infringement on the rights of authors.

We would earnestly solicit all Americans, of all parties, to attend to the communication which we this day publish, respecting the inefficacy of gun-boats as a defence for the nation. Editors of newspapers would act a very patriotic part, by giving it a place in their papers.

The Silli-kickaby gents.—hereafter, if we think them *high enough to sit.*

For the Weekly Inspector.

THE ORPHAN.

'Twas on a winter's eve, when all was cold,
And the sad north blew desolation wide,
Along the azure vault of Heaven was roll'd
One universal, foaming, fleecy tide.

Amid the darken'd air, the snow was blown,
The troubled winds their anger murmur'd round;
And mad'ning clouds, with wildest tempest torn,
Shed their cold wrath upon the frozen ground.

A lovely female at this lonely hour,
With steps bewilder'd, trod the trackless plain;
Her bosom heav'd beneath the snowy shower,
And her hair floated wild like one insane.

No neighbouring cottage cheer'd with taper bright,
Or hope imparted to her chilly breast,
But all around was lost in gloomy night,—
Her trembling limbs could find no place of rest.

Her eyes one moment beam'd with horror wild,
As it by hideous spectres, they were pain'd;
By grief then soften'd, they became more mild,
On her pale cheek the frozen tear remain'd.

Mercy! ye Heavens! with anguish, loud she cried;
Oh! spare an *Orphan* 'mid this scene of death;
She hush'd—the cruel winds around her sigh'd,
And still the snow drove o'er the frigid heath.

"Unpitying elements, why spend thy rage
Upon the breast which throbs with grief and wo;
Why wilt thou then, thy ireful warfare wage,
And crush the unprotected female low?"

Soft wails her youth, beguil'd from virtue's way,
Her angel innocence and spotless fame
Became to faithless promises a prey,
And fell from virtuous pride to lawless shame.

Wide on the world the ruin'd helpless maid
Was by her faithless lover left to stray,
To tread, distracted, through the valley's shade,
Or court with desperate step, the ocean's spray.

Wilt thou then aid, increase the wretch's pain,
To beat to earth the flow'r which droops its head?
Rather with vernal winds its life sustain,
And raise it healthful from its lowly bed.

Anguish had given way to milder grief—
She droop'd her head, exclaim'd in accents low,
On thy drear heath I need not such relief,
Here must I die, here must I end my wo.

Why should I grieve, alas! I have no home,
No kindred, friend, my wounded breast to heal;
And if I live, 'tis living but to roam,
'Mid those who seldom for the wretched feel.

As the rude wind, which passes with a sigh,
And heedless of its victim, on is flown,
So the unpitying, cruel world moves by,
And leaves the solitary wretch to mourn.

On Julia then, beat thou, inclement blast!
'Tis time this cruel world her griefs should fly;
Rock'd by thy tempest, she will breathe her last,
And 'mid thy warring clamours learn to die.

Scarce from her lips had the sad accents fled,
E'er she fell lifeless on the drifting snow;
The blast howl'd o'er her corpse and frozen bed,
And with the blast fled hapless Julia's wo.

OWEN.

We are happy in being able to present our readers the following morceau, the production of an American poet, who has obtained high and well deserved celebrity. It bears marks of the *mens divinior;* and to the inspiration of the *poet* seems to be added that of the *prophet*. The author of "The Pursuits of Literature," and some of the British essayists have, at times, indulged in apprehensions similar to those which this author has here expressed.

We think, however, that reflections of the melancholy kind, ought not to be carried so far as to impede the exertions of good men to counteract this tendency in nations, to moulder and crumble to pieces. The fallacy of the idea, that a nation like an individual in society, has, *of necessity*, its infancy, youth, manhood, and decrepitude, has been exposed by Burke. Sometimes, indeed, the destiny of a nation, and even that of the civilized world, may depend on the exertions of an individual. A Cromwell, a Joan of Arc, or a Bonaparte, may change the face of the moral, and even in a measure, that of the natural world;—and a Philosopher like Voltaire, may stamp the character and fix the destiny of the human race for centuries.

The following lines, taken from an unpublished Poem, were written in March, 1791, and were suggested by the retrospect of the fortunes of some of the most powerful nations, and most celebrated cities of antiquity.

Is this of realms the fate, the mournful end
To which must all inevitably tend?
Must each, in turn, lament the same sad doom,
By Heaven prescrib'd for nations yet to come;
And as their fame has shone, their empire spread,
Oblivion o'er them roll its deep'ning shade?
Ere long, perhaps, by barb'rous rule opprest,
Shall Europe's realms this fatal truth attest;
Ere long shall, haply, o'er her beauteous land,
Stern Desolation wave his sterile wand;
Her fairest plains to desert wastes be turn'd,
Her arts neglected, her refinements spurn'd;
While moss-grown walls, and heaps of ruins rude,
Shall mark the place where once her cities stood;
Where gay Lutetia's splendid scenes are spread,
Shall the rank thistle wave its lonely head;
And London's domes, in wide destruction hurld,
Convey a future moral to the world?
Yon cities, too, in infant pride that rise,
And shine, Columbia, 'mid thy favour'd skies,
Some future day may see, in dust o'erthrown,
With brambles shadowed, and with moss o'ergrown;
Some future day the trav'ler, haply, come,
To view their ruins from his distant home;
From western shores, with brilliant cities grac'd,
The seats of science, elegance, and taste,
Where now Alaska lifts her forests rude,
Or Nootka rolls its solitary flood;
While o'er the spot, contemplative, he strays,
Where Philadelphia caught the admiring gaze;
'Mid ambient waves, York's proud emporium shone,
Or fair Bostonia grac'd her eastern throne;
No peop'led domes, no spires ascending high,
No scenes of culture please his pensive eye;
No human voice he hears—the desert plain
Knows but the Whipperwill's funereal strain:
The hern's hoarse clang, or sea-gull's piercing cry,
Mix'd with the moan of winds that sadly sigh.
O'er many a shatter'd pile, and broken stone,
Of sculptur'd form in mournful unison;
Save, haply, startled at the human tread,
From some gray tomb by withering fern o'erspread.
Slow rears the rattle-snake his glistening crest,
And sounds of horror fill the dreary waste.

Published for THOMAS GREEN FESSENDEN, at E. SARGEANT'S Bookstore, No. 39, Wall-street, opposite the U. S. Bank.
PRINTED BY HOPKINS AND SEYMOUR, AT WASHINGTON'S HEAD.